



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,312	02/25/2002	David Kammer	PALM-3741.US.P	5496

7590 06/12/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/083,312	Applicant(s) KAMMER ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuan A. Tran	Art Unit 2682	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phillipps (WO 02/09362).

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Phillipps discloses a system and method of establishing a Bluetooth wireless connection between handheld computers (See fig. 2) comprising: a) storing a plurality of Bluetooth device identifications corresponding to a plurality of handheld computer systems on a memory resident list of a specific handheld computer system (See page 3, lines 30-34); b) accessing the device identifications on the specific handheld computer system (See page 3, lines 30-34); c) and establishing a

Art Unit: 2682

Bluetooth connection between the specific handheld computer system and the plurality of handheld computer systems, wherein the establishing bypasses a Bluetooth discovery process (See page 4, lines 1-2).

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1 and 19, as apparatus.

Regarding claims 2 and 20. Phillipps discloses as cited in claims 1 and 19. Phillipps further discloses at least one of the plurality of Bluetooth device identifications is automatically determined in communications between the specific handheld computer system and members of the plurality of handheld computer systems prior to step c) (See page 3, lines 27-28).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 2 and 20, as apparatus.

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Phillipps discloses as cited in claims 1 and 19. Phillipps further discloses at least one of the plurality of Bluetooth device identifications is entered by a user of the specific handheld computer system (See page 3 line 34 to page 4 line 1).

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 3 and 21, as apparatus.

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Phillipps discloses as cited in claims 1 and 20. Phillipps further discloses step b) further comprises: b1) accessing the plurality of device identifications; b2) displaying representations of the plurality of device identifications on a display of the specific handheld computer system; b3) and including

at least one handheld computer system corresponding to one of the plurality of Bluetooth device identifications in the Bluetooth wireless connection (See page 3 line 30 to page 4 line 2).

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 4 and 22, as apparatus.

Regarding claims 5 and 23. Philipps discloses as cited in claims 4 and 22. Philipps further discloses one of the representations of the plurality of device identifications is a Bluetooth friendly name (known Bluetooth device type) (See page 4 lines 23-34).

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 5 and 23, as apparatus.

Regarding claims 6 and 24, Philipps discloses as cited in claims 1 and 20. Philipps further discloses step d) responsive to a failure of step c), beginning the Bluetooth discovery process (See page 5 lines 3-10).

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 6 and 24, as apparatus.

Regarding claim 7, Philipps discloses a method of rejecting a Bluetooth communication request (See fig. 4) comprising: a) receiving a Bluetooth communication request at a handheld computer, wherein the communication request comprises a device identification; b) automatically accessing on the handheld computer a memory resident list of trusted device identifications; c) and rejecting a Bluetooth

communications request if the device identification is not a member of the list of trusted device identification (See fig. 4 and col. 3 line 30 to col. 4 line 11).

Regarding claim 8, Phillipps discloses as cited in claim 7, Phillipps further discloses displaying a representation of the device identification on a display of the handheld computer (See page 3 lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 9, Phillipps discloses as cited in claim 8. Phillipps further discloses the representation of the device is a Bluetooth friendly name (known Bluetooth device type) (See col. 4 lines 23-24).

Regarding claims 10-11, Phillipps discloses as cited in claim 7. In Bluetooth communication protocol, the communication request inherently comprises a page message or an inquiry message.

Regarding claim 12, Phillipps discloses as cited in claim 7, Phillipps further discloses an entry in the list of trusted device identifications is automatically determined in a communication between the handheld computer and another Bluetooth enabled device (See page 3 lines 27-28).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argued that Phillipps page 4 lines 1-2 does not teach or suggest the limitation of "wherein said establishing bypasses a Bluetooth discovery process" as

Art Unit: 2682

recited in claim 1 (See Remark, pages 3-4). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's argument because Phillipps page 3 lines 30-34 and page 4 lines 1-2, as cited in the Office Action mailed on 12/14/2005, does clearly show each and every single limitations of claim 1 wherein the establishment of a Bluetooth connection bypasses a Bluetooth discovery process. Further, the claim (claim 1) itself is not narrow enough to prevent the stored Bluetooth device identification, for the establishment of the Bluetooth connection, from being obtained by communications (Bluetooth inquiry process) in the past.

The Applicant argued that Phillipps fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "said device identification is entered by a user of said second handheld computer system" as recited in claim 3 (See Remark, pages 4-5). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's argument because keying a phone number (by depressing 7 to 10 digits) or selecting an entry from the phone directory is a way to enter the phone number to place a call from a mobile communication device and Phillipps does clearly show this limitation (See page 3 line 30 to page 4 line 2).

The Applicant argued that Phillipps fails to teach the limitations of claim 6 (See Remark, page 6). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments because Phillipps does disclose the limitations of claim 6 (See figs. 4-5 and page 4 lines 4-11 and page 5 line 1-10). Further, due to the mobility of the mobile device in the Bluetooth environment (being in-range at the instant time t_1 and being out-of-range at the instant time t_2), it is necessary to start the inquiry process, in response to a failure of

connection establishment, in order to locate the mobile device (See Phillipps, page 3 lines 27-28).

The Applicant argued that Phillipps fails to teach the limitation of "rejecting a Bluetooth communication request" as cited in claim 7 (See Remark, pages 6-7). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's argument because Phillipps does teach the step of rejecting a Bluetooth communication request by displaying error message and terminating the process (See fig. 4).

Upon the Applicant's request (See Remark, page 8), the Examiner would like to present the U.S. Patent No. 6,590,928 issued to Haartsen as evidence to show a Bluetooth communication request is either in a form of a page message or an inquiry message (See Haartsen, col. 11 line 48 to col. 12 line 15, col. 13 lines 40-48, col. 13 line 49 to col. 14 line 5).

For that reasons, the rejections are proper and stand for all the pending claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2682

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Tuan Tran



Matthew D. Anderson
SPE - 2618